



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/307,452	05/07/1999	TAL LAVIAN	NTL-3.2.076/	4857

26345 7590 07/07/2003

GIBBONS, DEL DEO, DOLAN, GRIFFINGER & VECCHIONE
1 RIVERFRONT PLAZA
NEWARK, NJ 07102-5497

EXAMINER

JACKSON, JENISE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/307,452

Applicant(s)

LAVIAN ET AL.

Examiner

Jenise E Jackson

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,8-11 and 13-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6,7,12 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 8-9 are rejected for being unclear, because claim 9 is an incomplete claim. The Examiner cannot ascertain, what the Applicant is claiming after the semicolon.

Therefore, since the claim is incomplete the Examiner will only apply art before the semicolon.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (Yerxa and Karve) in view of Bott.

5. As per claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 13, Yerxa teaches that Java has a Java Virtual Machine, that consists of three parts, one of which is the security manager(SM, i.e. security association manger). Yerxa teaches that the security manger monitors file access, system I/O, network I/O, etc...(see, pg. 2). Further, Yerza teaches that when an applet performs one of the above actions, it first consults for the SM for approval(see pg. 2). Also, Yerxa teaches that the SM decides if the action is permissible based on the origin of the application or applet(see pg. 2). Therefore, the Examiner asserts that Yerxa provides security against unauthorized access when the applet

Art Unit: 2131

performs one of the above actions. Yerxa teaches that whenever a possibly dangerous function is called from within the applet or application, the SM grants or denies access to specific resources based on the origin of the application or applet. Further, Yerxa teaches that the administrator can restrict access to an applet based on its digital signature. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that security manager determines the origin of the application by checking the digital signature. The Examiner asserts that Yerxa teaches receiving a digital signature at a security manager, because the security manger determines the origin of the application, and Yerxa teaches that applications have digital signatures, thus Yerxa teaches receiving a digital signature at a security manger.

6. Although Yerxa is silent on the code or key that is used with a digital signature. The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well-known in the art of digital signatures, that a key(i.e. code) pair is used for encryption and decryption, the motivation is that integrity is insured because one would need the corresponding key in order to decrypt. Proof that a digital signature has a corresponding pair can be taught in Karve. Karve teaches that an applet with a digital signature a public and private key. Also, Karve teaches that something can be encrypted with a public key, and decrypted with a corresponding private key(see pg. 3 of Karve). Therefore, the Examiner asserts that Karve teaches an encryption code and de-encryption code.

7. Further, Karve discloses that the browser verifies the code and then the JVM allows the applet to run on the client machine. The Examiner asserts that the security manager is inside of the browser. Furthermore, the SM authenticates the de-encrypted digital signature, because Karve states that the browser verifies the code, and the code as taught in Yerxa and Karve has a digital signature, than the Examiner asserts Yerxa and Karve teach that the SM authenticates the

Art Unit: 2131

de-encrypted digital signature; and the SM de-encrypted the digital signature with the de-encryption code(see above for explanation).

8. However, Yerxa and Karve are silent on the SM requesting a de-encryption code, and requesting allowed operations associated with the authenticated signature. The Examiner looks towards Bott. It would have been obvious to modify Yerxa and Karve with Bott, the motivation is that how does the security manager know the certificate is legitimate? Bott teaches that the certificate authority checks the digital signature on the certificate against the secure certificate it originally issued. Furthermore, Bott teaches that if the certificate is valid the browser used the key(i.e. code) to do whatever task. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that Bott teaches SM requesting a de-encryption code, because the CA(i.e. certificate authority) in Bott has the corresponding key(i.e. de-encryption code), and the browser uses this code to perform task or allowed operations(see Bott).

9. As per claims 2, 10, 14 wherein the network device includes a Java enabled device, is not explicitly taught; however, it is implicit because Yerxa teaches that Java is used. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that there is a Java enabled device.

10. As per claims 3, 11, 16-17, the Examiner takes Official Notice that a encryption code includes a private key and a de-encryption code includes a public key certificate associated with a private key, the motivation is that integrity is issued because in order to decrypt one must have the de-encryption code. The Examiner asserts that a private key and public key, can be used to encrypt and decrypt respectively or decrypt and encrypt respectively, this is taught by Schneier(see pg. 37).

Art Unit: 2131

11. As per claim 15, the Examiner asserts that a downloadable file is an applet or application, and Yerxa taught above teaches of digital signatures.

12. Claims 6-7, 12, 18 are objected to as being dependent on rejected base claims. Claims 6-7, 12, 18, are allowable for the feature of a policy server authenticating, and receiving a request for allowed operations.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jenise E Jackson whose telephone number is (703) 306-0426. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (6:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.) alternate Friday's.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gail Hayes can be reached on (703) 305-9711. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-0040 for regular communications and (703) 308-6306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

June 24, 2003


GAIL HAYES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100